

Needs for Rural Developmental State of Nigeria: The case of Kano State

Popoola, Oladayo Timothy and Ogunlade, Maria Funmilayo

Department of Economics, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria

poladayo@gmail.com, ogunlademaria@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This paper examine dimension of rural areas' challenges in Kano State of Nigeria. Evidence from 200 youth living in Sabuwar Unguwa, Turawa, Unguwar Mani villages and environ, Karaye Local Government of Kano State reveals that many young people are out of the rural communities to urban areas because of push-factors – extreme poverty and hunger, joblessness, dilapidated school building, drop-out, lack of portable water supply, expensive modern agricultural inputs, irregular supplies and high cost of fertilizer. Therefore recommends that there should be public-private investments to directly increase the productivity of the rural agriculture as well as creating enabling environments for local entrepreneurs to develop large scale commercial agriculture which could reduce youth migration to urban cities. Also, governments can motive the rural workers (doctors, nurses, teachers etc) by paying higher wages beyond what is obtainable for the same job in the urban sectors. This will influence more people to prefer working in the rural communities and also motivate them to contribute to the development of such sector. On the other hand, this will also reduce congestion and crime in the urban sector.

Keywords: Rural Development, Economic Growth, Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

The needs for rural development is becoming very important considering the fact that higher proportion of Nigerian are living in rural areas. The common experience of these individuals includes lot of misery, under-development, poverty and lack and inadequacy of social amenities. As [1] opines, the potential labour force that could have contributed to the improvement of rural economy are constantly moving into cities and nearby towns in search of better standards of living and benefits they presumed could exist in the cities. Meanwhile, youth migration from rural communities to urban cities poses problems not only to rural communities but also the urban dwellers. However, migrant youths are more concerned about the assumed benefits they hope to derive from the process.

Although, this experience is not only peculiar to the Nigeria economy, because [2] also notes that there has been much out-migration by the youth from Nanumba South District in Northern Region of Ghana to urban cities in the country. In another study, [3] contends that rate of urban population growth increases over the years in many African countries including Ghana (Accra), Nigeria (Lagos), and Kenya (Nairobi) as a result of youth migration. This over time seem too been major challenging issue for rural economies, urban dwellers, policy makers, and governments especially in Nigeria. For example, this might be the

major factor responsible for high cost of farming in the rural areas, reduced rural household wealth which has leads to increased vulnerability in many rural communities, and food insecurity in Nigeria.

As [4] suggests, rural youth pulls to the areas of prosperity (urban cities) and pushed from areas of economy decline (rural communities). Most of the youth usually leave their family members, farm and even withdrawn from school to migrant to urban areas. Although, it seem that after Nigeria's independence (in early 1960s), concentration of development efforts were on the urban cities and almost all infrastructural facilities were built in Lagos, Abuja and other important cities of Nigeria, of which most of the resources used for these developmental social amenities were mostly revenue generated from investment in the rural economic base of Nigeria. In addition, numbers of development strategies have been pursued by the various governments at all levels in Nigeria. These developmental strategies which consists the establishment of social infrastructural projects were all given to ramifications of modernization process in mainly urban cities of Nigeria.

However, rural areas are limited in terms of infrastructural provision. Largely, the economic activity in the rural communities in Nigeria revolves around the exploitation or utilization of land. It

centres principally on farming, fishing, and hunting even in this modern century. The unavailability of basic economic and social infrastructure such as, water supply, accessible roads, and health facilities due to rural-urban investment imbalance seem to be one of the major causes of low rural employment, low agricultural productivity, and low standard of living of rural community people. It is mainly in the rural sectors in Nigeria that much under-spending of planned expenditure occurs, as evidenced in the relatively low level of private and public investments in the rural areas.

Therefore, this study explored the perception of youth in Karaye Local Government Area (LGA) of Kano State on those factors responsible for youth migration to urban cities in Nigeria rural communities. And to specifically describe the socio-economic characteristics of youth in rural communities using the rural communities in Karaye LGA, to identify major challenges facing rural communities and to also identify possible solutions and policy measures to address these challenges. To achieve these objectives, the paper is divided into six sections. The first is the introductory part, while the second examines some of the reasons why youth migrates to more developed cities in Nigeria, theoretical literature and framework and empirical studies reviewed. Section three presents rural development of Nigeria, effects of rural-urban migration, and model of migration. Section four focuses on methodology while five present the results and discussion. In section six, the paper presents recommendations and policy issues.

SOME REASONS WHY YOUTH MIGRATE TO URBAN CITIES

The decision of youth to consider the choice of moving from rural communities to urban cities therefore, may involve contextual factors, such as pull factor which are desirable. These factors typically reflect the relative strength of the local economies – availability of public goods. Although rural-urban migration has long been recognized as one of the main problems of rural development in Nigeria, and yet government efforts to deal with it have not been successful [5,6,7]. As a result of this, many rural communities suffer from loss of manpower necessary for rural development. Simple justification of this might be the out-migration of able-bodied youths in search for

better living standard in urban areas. More importantly, and in spite of this pathetic situation in the rural areas in Nigeria, it is apparent to examine the impacts of decision of youth migrating from the rural communities to urban cities.

Theories

Push-pull factors theory

The understanding to youth migrating from rural to urban cities is explained by the traditional “push-pull” factors developed by [8,9]. Lee explained that there are circumstances that make youth to leave their home and family for other areas. These reasons are referred to as “push factors”. Some of these includes: famine, drought, low agricultural productivity, unemployment, extreme poverty, among many others. [10] contented that other push factors might include inadequacy of incomes coupled with poverty in the rural areas which also pushed youth out of their communities in search of better sources of livelihoods in the urban cities. On the other hand, there are factors known as “pull factors” that attract youth from rural villages to migrants to urban cities. These factors might include, better lifestyle, provision of services such as: electricity, public services which make urban cities attractive, increasing awareness through media accessibility, social networks and improved educational standards; which acts as an incentive for more out-migration of youths from rural communities.

Lewis dual-sector model

Dual Sector Model was proposed by Princeton University Professor, Sir Arthur W. Lewis in 1954. Lewis classified economy into two types: (i.) the agricultural (rural) sector, and (ii.) the industrial (urban) sector. The model explains the transition of labour between two sectors in the economy; from the Rural Sector to the Urban Sector. This was enumerated in his article entitled: “*Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour*” [11,12].

The model explains how the developing economy (Nigeria inclusive) moves from a traditional agricultural base to a manufacturing led economy.

From the dual sectors model, we can characterize the two sectors as follows:

(a.) Rural Sector:

- i. Inefficiently employed labour;
- ii. Low agricultural productivity;
- iii. Low income and savings; and
- iv. Extreme poverty despite low cost of living.

These are Push Factors

- i. High productivity of manufactured products;
- ii. High income and wages;
- iii. High savings, despite high cost of living;
- iv. Recreational facilities i. e. stadia and sporting activities; and
- v. Efficient educational facilities.

These are Pull Factors.

(b.) Urban Sector:

Table 2.1: Summary form of some of the empirical literature reviewed

Author	Study area	Argument	Estimating techniques
[15]	Nanumbra South District, Ghana	Perceptions of the rural community members cause their out-migration, with effect on availability of food. They also found that two push-factor-poor educational services and poor health services, serves as a major motivation for migration.	Chi-square analysis; SPSS
[2]	Metropolitan area of Sokoto city	Many youth between the ages of 18 and 27 years of age migrated to the cities due to lack of social amenities.	Chi-square analysis, SPSS 16.0 version
[3]	Odenda L.G.A., Ogun State	The perceived factors that mainly caused rural-urban migration include: boredom in agriculture, unemployment and expulsion due to offence or crime committed in the rural community. He also explained that Inadequacy of other social amenities and good schools are mainly factors responsible for migration.	Chi-square analysis; Correlation analysis
[16]	Selected Local Government Areas in Lagos State	Avoidance of boredom in agriculture and inadequate social amenities contribute largely to rural-urban migration of youth.	Logistic Regression
[17]	Nigeria	The migrants are attracted by developmental infrastructures in urban cities.	Descriptive analysis

Source: Authors' reviews

With higher wages that attract youths, the model explained that more youths will migrate to urban cities; but advancement in technology would lead to a lower demand for labour in the industrial sectors; this factor is the cause of mass unemployment in urban

sector today. In other words, has the economy is developing; most industries will employ capital-intensive techniques of production. Also, the higher wage in urban areas does not mean that people will

save more. This implies possibilities of spending more on imported goods.

In essence, factors responsible for youth migrating to urban cities are very paramount to this study. Thus, the study adopt the “*push-pull*” factors developed by [8]; that explained that there are circumstances that make youth to leave their home and family for other areas and these are referred to as “push factors”. Examples includes: famine, drought, low agricultural productivity, unemployment, extreme poverty, among many others.

Empirical Literature Review

Many studies indicate that push factors such as explained by [8] (for example lack of rural credit to obtain modern farm equipment and fertilizer; unemployment; and general rural poverty) are most important while others suggest that economic pull factors (e.g. perception of high wages from urban employment) are predominant. A number of other motivations for rural-urban migration including educational opportunities offered in urban cities, marriage and joining the family already at the destination are cited in the literature. Also, some studies suggest that rural-urban migration is facilitated by the concentration of migrants of same origin in the destination city [13, 14].

Table 2.1 provides the argument of some of the studies reviewed. However, the central argument of this paper is that there are factors responsible for young people migration from rural areas to more develop urban cities.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT OF NIGERIA

Rural-Urban migration of youths in Nigeria has been the problem of rural development in Nigeria. Usually, the rural communities are commonly characterized by the following: extreme poverty and hunger, dilapidated school building, high drop-out rate. Others are: low farm yield, which might leads to low profitability; lack and inadequate portable water supply; expensive agricultural inputs; irregular supplies of fertilizer; absent and/or irregular supply of electricity; not functional literacy centres among host of others.

All these characteristics lead to push able-bodied youth and young people from the rural areas to urban areas. As a result of this, human capital resources, such as: talent, skills, creative ideas, innovation, human energy and labour strength that are supposed to be useful for economic development of rural sectors are migrated to the urban sectors. Urban sectors are on the other hand, characterized by: modern education systems, higher wages and salaries, infrastructural facilities, public goods e.t.c.

Over the years, many governmental efforts to deal with rural-urban migration have not been successful. In relation to agriculture, which is the major attribute of rural sectors in Nigeria, by far the greatest problem has been that of low productivity, extreme poverty and hunger. These can be attributed to the fact that, very large proportions of the population are seeking for non-agricultural occupations in the urban areas [5].

The food security situation in Nigeria and other has over the years deteriorated and many people now face the problem of hunger and malnutrition [18].

Effects of Rural-Urban Migration

The following as being the effects of rural-urban migration in Nigeria: (i.) loss of manpower and human capital resources, (ii.) low agricultural productivity, (iii.) low rural demand for manufactured goods, (iv.) educued foreign exchange, (v.) high importation of foods, and (vi.) congestion, crimes and social unrest.

Model of Migration

Insight from theories and empirical studies reviewed help to model rural-urban migration as follows:

Let:

- M =Youth migration level from Rural community to Urban cities in Nigeria;
- $M^R =$ =Rate of youth migrating over a period of time t ;
- P^U =Probability of migrated youth being employed in the urban cities;
- P^R =Probability of being employed in the rural sector
- W =Urban average wage level;
- w = Rural average wage level;
- E^U = Urban employment level;

E^R =Rural employment level;
 U^U =Urban unemployment level;
 U^R =Rural unemployment level
 K =Pull factors

Sector
Population:

Differences **115,795**

Usually, from Lewis Model,
for M to exist, $W > w$ (1)

If P^UM = Expected Urban earnings; and P^RM =
Expected Rural Earnings

Then, $M^R = K(P^UW - P^RW)$ (2)

M also exist, if P^UW (3)

If equation (3) holds, K is (4)

And both equation (3) and (4) will cause higher M .

To achieve rural sector economic development in Nigeria, M^R and M must be reduce, by improving infrastructural facilities in the rural areas.

From Table 1 (see Appendix), which shows Nigeria Rural Sector Population and Urban Sector Population between the period of 1980 to 2013 (Rural Sector Population and Urban sector Population were obtained from [19]).

In year 1980, for example, the rural sector population was 52,633,708 while the urban sector population was 21,064,391. From the figures, it indicated that larger Nigerian was living in the rural sector, and by finding the differences the result is 31,569,317 (excess of rural dwellers over urban dwellers).

In year 1981, the population of Rural Sector increased by 957,840 (i.e 53,591,548-52,633,708), while that of Urban Sector was increased by 1,073,635 (i.e 22,138,026-21,064,391).

By differencing, 1,037,635 were more than 957,840 by 115,795.

Example:	<u>1981:</u>	<u>1980:</u>	<u>Differences:</u>
Urban	22,138,026	21,064,391	1,073,635
Sector			
Population			
Rural	53,591,548	52,633,708	<u>957,840</u>

Assumption

1. Since most Rural Sector dwellers are mostly agriculturalist, most of them might likely be polygamists, while most people in the Urban Sector are monogamists; thereby, the birth rate of Rural Sector might be greater than the Urban Sectors i. e. $RS^{br} US^{br}$.
2. Since most Urban Sector dwellers have access to quality health care services (private health service inclusive) than the Rural Sector dwellers, where some of the clinic are distanced and mostly there might not be qualify medical practitioners and/or lack of drugs. Thereby, the death rate in Rural Sector might be greater than death rate in the Urban Sectors. i. e. $RS^{dr} US^{dr}$.
3. Now, supposing the excess of birth rate (i. e. $RS^{br} US^{br}$) equate that of the death rate (i.e. $RS^{dr} US^{dr}$) in Rural Sector; and also the less birth rate equate the fewer death rates in the Urban Sector.

Based on the three premises above, the claim is rate at which both sectors' population increases will be the same, and excess will be accounted for migration from rural communities to urban cities. Therefore, the excess of urban cities over rural communities (i.e. 115,795) was the number of youth migrates from rural communities to urban cities in Nigeria between the period of 1980 and 1981.

Similarly from the table II (see Appendix), it can be noted that in 2013, the population of urban cities is now greater than rural communities, compare to years in 1980s and 1990s; indicating that many youth from the rural communities in Nigeria had migrated to cities.

METHODOLOGY

The study made used of primary data collected through survey using questionnaire. The survey was conducted among 200 rural youth in Karaye Local Government of Kano State. The focus on rural youth allowed the study to evaluate factors responsible for youth migration from rural communities to urban cities of Nigeria. The justification is that human capital resources – talent, skills, creative ideas, innovation,

human energy, and labour strength that are supposed to be useful for economic development of rural communities are migrating to cities in Nigeria as a result of push factors, such as: extreme poverty and hunger, joblessness, dilapidated school building, drop-out from schools, lack of portable water supply, expensive modern agricultural inputs, irregular supplies and high cost of fertilizer, among host of others social amenities.

Study Area

Karaye is a Local Government Area in Kano State, which was created in May 1989. It is located about 90km West of Kano city. However, it has an estimated population of about 141,407 (2006 Census), with a district areas including seventeen (17) villages. The People of Karaye Community are Hausa/Fulani and, a liberal land indeed hospitalizing different tribes from all walks of life. Their major occupation is farming and trading, while among the goods they deal in trading involves fish, cows and, grains (maize, corn, millet, beans, and rice). Sabuwar Unguwa, Turawa and Mani villages were selected randomly from Karaye Local Government Area, because there villages are rural communities.

Method of Analysis

Specifically, a multi-stage sampling technique was used to select youth between the ages of 8 and 25 years old. The study administered 200 structured questionnaires, 40 questionnaires to each of the five rural communities selected (Sabuwar Unguwa, Turawa and Mani villages, and their environs) which was interpreted to respondents in English and Hausa languages.

The first part of the questionnaires consists of the demographic characteristics of the respondents (young people), but the second focus on those factors responsible for youth migration to urban areas. Descriptive statistics was employed to show the characteristics of respondents. The study employed descriptive statistics to show the characteristics of respondents (as presented in appendix.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table I reveal (see appendix) the socio-economic characteristics of respondents in Sabuwar Unguwa, Turawa and Mani villages, and environs. These

revealed that 52.5 per cent of the respondents were between the ages of 15-20 years of age, while 47.5 per cent were between 10-15 years of age. These ages are important factor that determines the acquisition of skills through vocational trainings or advancing in higher education.

Education is also an important determinant which creates positive mental attitude towards the adoption of modern farming innovation [20]. The table also indicated that 21.5 per cent of the respondents' parents are farmers while other are: farm product traders, teachers, and civil servants among others. Also, majority of the respondents speaks English, Hausa and Arabic; this which serves as upper hand to compete with urban youths.

About 87.0 per cent of the respondents have at least once visited urban cities, while 72.5 per cent of the responds are willing to migrate to urban cities; as a result of inadequacy of social amenities in their various communities. This aligns with the findings of [21] that stressed that, educational factor, unemployment and inadequate social amenities are major constraints responsible for rural to urban migration in Nigeria. A worrisome situation observed in Table I which are major challenges facing youth in rural community are a high non-availability of boreholes water (81.5 per cent responds) and public health facilities (88 per cent of responds), which are the basic measure of quality of life in any society.

CONCLUSION

The result of the paper indicates that youth are out of the rural communities to urban areas because of 'push-factors' – extreme poverty and hunger, joblessness, dilapidated school building, drop-out, lack of portable water supply, expensive modern agricultural inputs, irregular supplies and high cost of fertilizer, among host of others.

As a result, human capital resources – talent, skills, creative ideas, innovation, human energy, and labour strength that are supposed to be useful for economic development of rural communities are migrating to the cities which are congested already. This signal that there should be public-private investments to directly increase the productivity of the rural agriculture as

well as creating enabling environments for local entrepreneurs to develop large scale commercial agriculture which could reduce youth migration to urban cities. The paper concluded that rural communities' development would reduce congestion and crime in the urban sector.

RECOMMENDATION

The following possible solutions and policy measures were recommended:

1. **Payment of Efficiency wages to rural workers:** Government at all levels (Local Governments, State Governments and Federal Government) can motivate the rural workers by paying higher wages beyond what is obtainable for the same position in the urban sectors. This will influence more people to prefer working in the rural sectors and motivate them to contribute to the development of such sector. On the other hand, this will also reduce the congestion and crime in the urban sector. For example, Government can increase the salary of primary school teachers by 50 percent, or introduce allowances for working in the rural sector. Many teachers and other workers will prefer the opportunities and contributes to the development of such sector; some on the other hand might involves in large scale agricultural farming and thereby increases the supply of foods, reduces the competing prices of such productivities in the market.
2. **Provision of Recreational facilities in the Rural areas:** Larger numbers of youth (if not all Nigerian Youth) developed interest in sporting activities. If recreational facilities like local stadia, swimming pools, cinema houses, viewing centres, amusement parks, etc are made available in rural areas (irrespective of its size), this will reduce the propensity of the youths moving to the urban sectors. This on the other hand, will keep many of them busy and even improve on their sporting activities and careers.
3. **Establishment of Rural Industries:** Both public and private organizations are encouraged to contribute to the growth of rural sector economy. The establishment of rural industries, projects and businesses that will absorb the working population and reverse labour movement from the rural areas will go a long

way in reducing rural-urban drift. Industries can even take the advantage of lower cost of obtaining labour services in the rural sectors.

4. **Educational Institutions:** Governments are encouraged to establish higher institutions in the rural areas, so as to develop the socio-economic activities in such areas. The establishment of colleges and other institutions of higher learning in rural areas will reduce the migration of youth to urban centers; and also attract youths in the urban sectors to migrate to the rural sectors and then reduces high competition for urban educational institutions in the urban sectors.

Also, Government should encourage and continue to improve rural compulsory education, improve new rural cooperative medical systems, and improve rural poverty alleviation standards.

5. **Legal enforcement:** There should be legal enforcement on migrant workers to urban sector, explore approaches for the farmers who have a stable job and residence in rural areas to gain a status as a city resident, establish the mechanisms of regular pay increase and pay guarantee. Also, enhance their employment, social security, housing and their childrens' education.
6. **Provision of social amenities:** The provision of social amenities such as: water supply, stable electricity supply, accessible roads network, telecommunication services, among others in the rural sectors will go a longer way to reducing the mass rate at which youth move to urban areas as a result of these infrastructural facilities.
7. **Transformation of traditional agriculture:** It is very paramount for rural areas to have transformed agricultural system. This will enable the youth to engage in agriculture as the system will make farming interesting and attractive.
8. **Establishment of corporate branches:** Government departments, business firms, and

financial institutions should be encouraged to establish their branches in rural sectors.

9. Government should expand budget for agriculture and strictly monitor the project in the rural areas. Also, government should invest more on rural infrastructure and governmental land-use free allocated to rural areas.

10. Prioritize water control in rural infrastructure construction, including supporting water conservancy projects on small farmland, encouraging water-saving irrigation, restoring crumbling reservoirs, intensifying farmland protection and soil amelioration, strengthening ecological rehabilitation and stepping up agricultural mechanization.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aromolaran AK. Assessment of benefits associated with rural-urban migration among non-migrants in Odeda Area, Ogun State, Nigeria". International Journal of Pure and Applied Sciences and Technology, 2013; 14(2): 31-38.
- [2] Ango AK. Impact of youth rural-urban migration on household economy and crop production: A case study of Sokoto Metropolitan areas, Sokoto State, Nigeria, in Academic Journals. 2014;6(4): 122-131
- [3] Dao, M. Determinants of Internal Migration in Developing Countries, Study Economic. 77, 35-51. Eastern Illinois University. 2002.
- [4] Braun Van, J. Towards a renewed focus on rural development. Agricultural and Rural Development Journal, 2004
- [5] Nwosu, EJ. Rural Development as a factor in National Development" in Reading in Social Sciences: Issues in National Development. 1979;110-113.
- [6] Makinwa, PK. The West African Migration System, paper presented and policies, IUSSP, Committee on International Migration, Malaysia, Sept. 1988
- [7] Afigbo, AE. Women as a factor in Development in M.O. Ijere (Ed), Women in Nigerian Economy; ACENA Publishers 1991
- [8] Lee, E. A Theory of Migration, Demography, 1966;3(1): 47-57
- [9] Griffin. The Political Economy of Agrarian Change, Macmillan, London, 1974
- [10] Afshar, R. Dynamics of Development and Population Mobility: The Bangladesh Case. AdHoc Expert Group Meeting on Migration and Development, organized by the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Bangkok, 27-29 August, 2003.
- [11] Dual Sector Model http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dual_sector_model. 2010
- [12] Fidelis Eze-Harrison. Economic Development: Theory and Policy Applications. 1996.
- [13] Makinwa, PK. Government Policies and Interests in Nigeria Migration, in W. F. Lichman, H. D. Lasswell, D. D. Montgomery and M. Weiner (eds) Policy Sociences and Population, Lexington, Mass: DC Health and Company. 1993.
- [14] Igbokwe, EM and Ajala, AA. Popular participation for rural development in Nigeria, Concepts, Processes and Prospects, Enugu: Auto-Century Publishing Company. 1995.
- [15] Anagbo JN. Perceived Impacts of Rural-urban migration on Agricultural Productivity in Nanumba South District of Northern Region of Ghana in Research on Humanities and Social Sciences, 2014
- [16] Aworemi, JR, Abdul-Azeez, IA. & Opoola, NA. An Appraisal of the Influencing Rural-Urban Migration in Some Selected Local Government Areas of Lagos State Nigeri., J of Sustainable Development, 2011;4 (3)
- [17] Isah, Mohammed Abass. Trends of Rural-Urban Migration in Nigeria, in European Scientific J. 2012; 8: 3
- [18] Problems Affecting Rural Communities in Kano State in Online Nigeria Community Portal of Nigeria, Jan 30th, 2003
- [19] World Bank, World Bank Development Indicator. Washington D.C. 2014.
- [20] Benor, D, Harrison JQ, and Baxter, M. Agricultural Extension: The Training and Visit System" Washington D. C. 1997.
- [21] Adewale JG. Socio-Economic factors associated with urban-rural migration in Nigeria: A case study of Oyo State, Nigeria. Nigeria Journal of Ecology, 2005; 17 (1) 13-16

APPENDIX

Table 1. Socio-Economic Characteristics of Respondents

Characteristic	Units	Frequency	Percentage (n=200)
Age	Below 10 years	0	0.0
	10 – 15	95	47.5
	15 – 20	105	52.5
	20 and above	0	0.0
Language	English	195	97.5
	Hausa	179	89.5
	Arabic	103	51.5
Occupation of parents	Farming	43	21.5
Sex	Female	195	97.5
	Male	5	2.5
Urban cities visitation	No response	3	1.5
	Yes	174	87.0
	No	23	11.5
	Total	200	100.0
Willingness to migrate to urban cities	No response	17	8.5
	Yes	145	72.5
	No	38	19.0
	Total	200	100.0
Access to social amenities: A. Access to boreholes	No Response	8	4.0
	Yes	163	81.5
	No	29	14.5
	Total	200	100.0
B. Access to public clinics	No Response	15	7.5
	Yes	176	88.0
	No	9	4.5
	Total	200	100.0

Source: Field Survey

Table 2. Nigerian Rural and Urban Areas Population (1980-2013)

Year	Rural Area Population¹	Urban Area Population²	Differences (rsp - usp)³	Percentage x 100%]⁴
1980	52,633,708	21,064,391	31,569,317	59.98%
1981	53,591,548	22,138,026	31,453,522	58.69%
1982	54,501,030	23,228,775	31,272,255	57.38%
1983	55,383,967	24,345,346	31,038,621	56.04%
1984	56,272,798	25,502,419	30,770,379	54.68%
1985	57,180,829	26,711,743	30,469,086	53.29%
1986	58,107,290	28,010,756	30,096,534	51.79%
1987	59,046,569	29,366,351	29,680,218	49.47%
1988	59,997,730	30,775,887	29,221,843	48.70%
1989	60,946,086	32,233,674	28,712,412	47.11%
1990	61,881,637	33,735,713	28,145,924	45.48%
1991	62,780,328	35,305,045	27,475,283	43.76%
1992	63,668,451	36,923,791	26,744,660	42.01%
1993	64,549,428	38,595,321	25,954,107	40.21%
1994	65,428,409	40,324,387	25,104,022	38.37%
1995	66,309,371	42,115,456	24,193,915	36.49%
1996	67,205,977	43,960,233	23,245,744	34.59%
1997	68,107,071	45,872,410	22,234,661	32.65%
1998	69,012,754	47,854,617	21,158,137	30.66%
1999	69,922,626	49,909,262	20,013,364	28.62%
2000	70,837,204	52,039,523	18,797,681	26.54%
2001	71,784,036	54,220,956	17,563,080	24.47%
2002	72,739,775	56,484,866	16,254,909	22.35%
2003	73,710,606	58,839,540	14,871,066	20.17%
2004	74,704,116	61,295,134	13,408,982	17.95%
2005	75,725,346	63,860,545	11,864,801	15.67%
2006	76,816,505	66,498,404	10,318,101	13.43%
2007	77,935,115	69,252,238	8,682,877	11.14%
2008	79,080,919	72,127,161	6,953,758	8.79%
2009	80,253,054	75,127,966	5,125,088	6.39%
2010	81,449,371	78,258,409	3,190,962	3.92%
2011	82,728,277	81,464,648	1,263,629	1.53%
2012	84,029,583	84,804,193	-774,610	-0.92%
2013	85,343,053	88,272,292	-2,929,239	-3.43%

Sources: World Development Indicators (2014)^{1,2}, World Bank Data (2014); Authors' computation^{3,4}